

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/711,770 | 11/13/2000 | Mark Alexander | 2836- P056D1 | 7762 | |
| | 7590 08/26/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| James J. Murphy, Esq. | | | MEI, XU | | |
| 5400 Renaissa 1201 Elm | nce Tower | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| Dallas, TX 7 | 5040 | 2644 | | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | | Applicatio | n No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--------|--|--|--|
| | | 09/711,77 | 0 | ALEXANDER ET A | AL. | | | |
| | | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Xu Mei | · | 2644 | | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply | appears on the | cover sheet with the c | orrespondence ad | dress | | | |
| A SH THE - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the may ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | N. 1.136(a). In no eve reply within the statu od will apply and will tute, cause the appli | nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1) 又 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 | November 20 | 000. | | | | | |
| | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | | | |
| , — | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ | Claim(s) 19-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 19-23 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Applicat | ion Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9)[| The specification is objected to by the Exam | iner. | | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| 11) | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority i | δ under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| 12) <u></u> a) | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a light section. | ents have beel ents have beel riority docume eau (PCT Rule | n received. n received in Applicati ents have been receive e 17.2(a)). | ion No ed in this National | Stage | | | |
| | ce of References Cited (PTO-892) | | 4) Interview Summary | | | | | |
| 3) Infor | ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ er No(s)/Mail Date | | Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | | O-152) | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "said noninverting input" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "said operational amplifier" in lines 6-7 and line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "said tap" in lines 3-4 and 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "said circuit" in lines 3-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Application/Control Number: 09/711,770

Art Unit: 2644

Claim 23 recites the limitation "said first and second sets of bits" in lines 13-14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segawa et al (US-5523721, hereafter, Segawa) in view of Williams (US-5249225).

Regarding claims 19 and 22, Segawa discloses an attenuator (see attenuator in Fig. 3) comprising a first stage including a first operational amplifier; a tapped resistor (9) having an input for receiving input data, an output coupled to an output of said first operational amplifier, and a plurality of taps (resistors 8) for selectively presenting a sequence of voltages to said noninverting input of said operational amplifier, each of said sequence of voltages corresponding to an attenuation

step, said first stage in response to said sequence of voltages stepping an attenuation produced by said attenuator from an intermediate value to a predetermined ending value. And Segawa discloses the attenuator including a decoder for selectively coupling a tap of the non-inverting input of the amplifier of the first stage. What's not taught by Segawa is the attenuator including a second stage with essentially the same structure as the first stage as claimed.

It is old and well known in the amplifier art to utilize cascade connection for multiple amplifier stages for improving accuracy and stability of signal(s) processing. Williams discloses an attenuator including tapped resistor with two stages in cascade connection (see Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the attenuator as shown by Segawa by having a second stage or additional stage as shown by Williams in order to improving accuracy and stability of signal(s) processing for the attenuator.

Regarding claim 20, the modified multi-stage attenuator of Segawa would have including separate decoders for different stage control as claimed.

- 5. Claims 21 and 23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ehni, Spitalny et al, Sculley, and Alexander et al are made of record here as pertinent art to the claimed invention.

The cited references above disclose various attenuators including tapped resistor for signals processing.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xu Mei whose telephone number is 703-308-6610. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:30-6:00), alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W Isen can be reached on 703-305-4386. The fax phone number for

Art Unit: 2644

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information

Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Xu Mei Primary Examiner Art Unit 2644 8/17/2004